

Comment	Section	Subject	Date Captured	Comment	Staff Analysis	Proposed Action	Applied
1	11	Formatting	1/30/2019	There are some SLDC defined terms that are not capitalized in the draft. These should be capitalized.	Staff has identified specific terms that should be capitalized because they are defined in the SLDC.	Capitalize defined terms.	Capitalized defined terms throughout the document.
2	11.1	Purpose	1/24/2019	No mention of temporal aspect of DCIs. The long-term impact of DCIs should be addressed in the purpose.	11.1 is the purpose section and does not directly address temporal impacts. Section 2.2.6 of the SGMP describes the purpose of DCI regulation including the long-term impacts. Staff has determined that modifying 11.1 to include mention of long-term impacts is appropriate.	Add long-term impacts to 11.1.	Added "long-term" to 11.1
3	11.11	Sand and gravel	1/30/2019	Add a requirement for a closure plan to the sand and gravel section.	This was an oversight that will be addressed.	Draft new section based on hardrock closure requirements 11.14.8	Added 11.11.4.6
4	11.11	sand and gravel	1/30/2019	Does not specify reclamation for small scale sand and gravel.	Small scale sand and gravel is addressed in Chapter 10 of the SLDC.	No action.	No change.
5	11.14	General	1/30/2019	The County amendments duplicate many state requirements of the NM Mining Act and Rules for new units and new mines. As a suggestion, the applicant may benefit from being able to submit the same documents to both the state and county, and supplement with additional information when needed to fulfill more stringent requirements.	This is a good suggestion and will be addressed during the processing of applications.	No action.	No change.
6	11.14	General	1/30/2019	It will require significant expertise and staff to implement these rules. Depending on how many hard rock mining operations the county has to deal with, this could be a strain on resources. Will this group be dedicated specifically to mine permitting?	The County will retain experts to assist in reviewing applications and monitoring compliance.	No action.	No change.
7	11.14	General	11/30/2019	The permitting process indicates all costs shall be recovered by the County from the Applicant/Permittee. Does the County have a resource estimate of the time and costs required for reviews, inspections and outside contractors?	The County will estimate these costs after the receipt of an application.	No action.	No change.

Comment #	Section	Subject	Date Captured	Comment	Staff Analysis	Proposed Action	Applied
8	11.4	DCI definition	1/24/2019	Include high voltage transmission lines as a DCI (issue of transmitting solar energy). Also, airstrips, launch sites, certain industrial operations, outdoor music and festival site, permanent outdoor film studios, power generating sites (geothermal etc.). All such operations have effects listed in 11.1.	The goal of this planning process and resulting regulations is to address DCIs as currently defined in section 2.2.6 of the SGMP and Ch. 11 of the SLDC. If directed by the BCC per 2.2.6.7 of the SGMP, staff will investigate other potential DCIs under a separate process.	No action.	No change.
9	11.4	definitions	1/31/2019	High voltage transmission lines should be defined as a DCI and the process to achieve that should be communicated to those who request it.	See response to Comment #4 above.	No action.	No change.
10	11.4	definitions	1/31/2019	High voltage transmission lines should be addressed as part of the current SLDC amendment process.	See response to Comment #4 above.	No action.	No change.
11	11.8	lighting	1/31/2019	The draft does not address light pollution or light trespassing conditions. This should be addressed in Chapter 11. (See SF Muni. Code for Outdoor Lighting and the IES documents)	Lighting requirements are included in Section 7.8 of the SLDC. These lighting requirements apply to all DCIs.	No action.	No change.
12	11.11.4.5; 11.14.2.10.4	blasting	1/30/2019	Both subsections require training, examination and blasting certification from MMD Director at EMNRD. This OSM training is a requirement for coal mining. MMD does not have this requirement for hardrock mines, though the Director can require a blasting plan.	The County intends to require training, permits and plans for both types of DCIs.	No action.	No change.
13	11.14.1.8	Purpose	1/30/2019	Add "associated impacts" to qualify extraction and processing.	This was an oversight that will be addressed.	Add "associated impacts"	Added "all potential costs of impacts associated with mineral resource extraction and processing."
14	11.14.10	Temporary cessation	1/30/2019	This is not reasonable. If ceasing for 24 hours triggers a temporary cessation process then this would happen every weekend. Consider keeping noticing requirement for unexpected cessation greater than 24 hours but changing other requirements to a longer period, perhaps 5 business days.	Staff agrees that this is too restrictive.	Change days of operation to Monday through Saturday (11.14.6.1) and change unplanned cessation period to 5 calendar days (11.14.10).	11.14.10 Replaced "for a period greater than twenty-four (24) consecutive hours" with "for an unplanned period greater than five (5) calendar days." 11.14.6.1 Changed from Friday to Saturday with Board discretion.

Comment #	Section	Subject	Date Captured	Comment	Staff Analysis	Proposed Action	Applied
15	11.14.2	Applicability	1/30/2019	Include definition of mineral resource extraction.	Agreed. See 19.10.1.7 NMAC for state definitions of mineral and mining.	Add definitions to the appendix. Make list of definitions.	Definitions for Exploration, Mineral, Mineral Resource Extraction and Processing, and Mining added to Appendix A. See 'Appendix Definitions 2.15.19'.
16	11.14.2	applicability	1/30/2019	the requirements may be onerous for a small-time miner, who pans for gold or disturbs less than 5 acres of mining. All applicants would have to create an extensive environmental impact report (subsection 11.7.1.8.1). Might want to change this for small mine operator. Would environmental impact be divided into no significant impact and significant impact?	The County intends to regulate all mineral resource exploration, extraction and processing.	No action.	No change.
17	11.14.2.3	exploration	1/30/2019	Current language could restrict mapping and surveying by USGS and others. Remove "of any type" from the end of paragraph.	Agreed. See 19.10.4 NMAC for state exploration applications.	Add definition of exploration to the appendix. Remove "of any type" from the end of paragraph.	Changes to 11.14.2.3 require Board approval of an exploration plan as part of the Overlay processes for mining; Definition of "exploration" added to Appendix.
18	11.14.2.4	uranium	1/30/2019	This section prohibits permits to extract or process uranium minerals or other radioactive material until the County adopts regulations. How might these regulations differ from the current regulations? MMD has a guideline for uranium mine reclamation.	The County will develop regulations for uranium in the future if an application for uranium mining is filed and will take state regulations into consideration in doing so.	No action.	No change.
19	11.14.3	design criteria	1/24/2019	is 1,000 year flood data feasible?	In consultation with our technical experts, it is determined that requiring 1000-yr flood data is feasible. NRC uses 1000-yr flood data in the design of their mining facilities.	No action.	No change.
20	11.14.3	Design Criteria	1/30/2019	Does this apply to operations, closure or both?	This applies to both operations and closure.	No action.	No change.
21	11.14.3.1	design criteria	1/30/2019	Design criteria set standard that mineral processing and extracting shall not cause or contribute to depletion of a water resource or contamination in perpetuity. This would likely exclude mining below the water table or dewatering to mine ore below the water table, for example, and would probably require complete backfilling of pits.	The design criteria is intended to protect the County's water resources. The application of the design criteria to a specific application is not within the scope of this regulation.	No action.	No change.

Comment #	Section	Subject	Date Captured	Comment	Staff Analysis	Proposed Action	Applied
22	11.14.3.2	Design criteria	1/30/2019	NRC uses the 1000 year standard and it results in very large flood mitigation facilities that are not always effective for day-to-day weather events. Consider 500-year standard.	Staff recognizes that a 1000-year flood design could be ineffective in certain scenarios. The LUA has the authority to allow or require designs that will handle smaller flows while preserving the requirement for a design that will handle larger flows anticipated in a changing climate regime (11.14.6.11.1).	No action.	No change.
23	11.14.3.2	1000-yr storm	1/30/2019	1000-yr storm requirement does not indicate the duration. For example MMD uses 100-yr/24 hr. storm. A 200-yr./24 hr. requirement may be more reasonable and more current analysis of climatic conditions would be worthwhile.	Agreed. Staff will indicate a duration.	Add: 24 hr. storm event.	11.14.3.2 Added "on thousand (1,000) year twenty-four (24) hour storm event"
24	11.14.4.16.3	Operating Plan	1/30/2019	Requirement does not make sense if active treatment is prohibited.	This was an oversight that will be addressed.	Remove 11.14.4.16.3	Removed: "3. a description of water treatment processes;"
25	11.14.4.22.2	reclamation	1/18/2019	In some places demonstrable is removed, in some places it is left, and in some places demonstrated is changed to demonstrable. They should be consistent. The qualification requirement is probably adequate because demonstrating the experience doesn't really make sense anyway.	Agreed. Demonstrable is not necessary. The LUA will evaluate expertise as part of the review process.	Remove demonstrable and demonstrated throughout the document.	Removed "demonstrable" and "demonstrated" throughout the document where referencing professional expertise.
26	11.14.4.8.9	Baseline data report	1/30/2019	The Baseline Data Report Requirement for a description of the ore body and mineralized zones may conflict with the NMMA 69-36-10 Confidentiality because operators may designate some exploration map, grade or location of ore reserves as confidential under state law.	To the extent that there is a conflict, the applicant can bring that to the LUA for consideration.	No action.	No change.
27	11.14.4.8	Reclamation	1/22/2019	Does not address removal of slag/ore material/ reclamation without starting a new mine. Need for regulations just for reclamation without new DCI.	Removal of historic mining materials for construction materials is considered a sand and gravel operation. Small scale sand and gravel would apply up to 20thou tons. Beyond that is a DCI. We did not consider the applicability of HRM to this situation of historic mine waste removal. In the future we could consider historic mine waste removal under a different process.	No action.	No change.

Comment #	Section	Subject	Date Captured	Comment	Staff Analysis	Proposed Action	Applied
28	11.14.4.8	Legacy mining	1/30/2019	The no active treatment clause of the design criteria (11.14.3.4) could prohibit treatment of existing sites in need of remediation. There should be an exception to this clause when remediating legacy mines.	We agree that treatment may be required to remediate legacy mines.	Add: "the LUA may allow an applicant to improve or remediate conditions at a legacy mine site to acceptable levels without complying with the active treatment clause of the design criteria (11.14.3.5)"	Add: "The Board may allow an applicant to improve or remediate conditions at a legacy mine site to acceptable levels without complying with the active treatment clause of the design criteria (11.14.3.5). "
29	11.14.6.5	Remediation of Contaminated baseline and legacy uses	1/18/2019	Section on sulfide ore was removed and replaced with section on contaminated baseline and legacy uses. Please explain this change.	This section was removed because it was duplicative and staff determined it would be impractical to implement.	No action.	No change.
30	11.14.6.10	wildlife	1/18/2019	Why is the wildlife provision removed from blasting?	Because wildlife impact mitigation was added as 11.14.4.19. This is a more comprehensive provision and applies to all aspects of the mine, including but not limited to blasting.	No action.	No change.
31	11.14.6.11.2	Contaminated baseline	1/30/2019	Add "as a result of anthropogenic activities" as a qualifier to contaminated baseline conditions.	Agreed. An applicant should not have to restore conditions beyond the natural baseline conditions existing before human activity.	Add: "and to the baseline condition existing before anthropogenic activity."	Added: "or to the baseline condition existing before anthropogenic activity"
32	11.14.6.4	Hazardous materials	1/30/2019	Mine waste is exempted from federal definition of hazardous materials. How does that exemption apply to this section?	To the extent that federal law controls the LUA will conform the permit accordingly. Mine waste is addressed in 11.14.6.7.	No action. Capitalize Hazardous Material throughout the document to reflect that it is defined in the SLDC appendix	Hazardous Materials capitalized throughout the document.
33	11.14.6.7	Storage	1/30/2019	Clean material like soils should be exempted from these storage requirements. Add "that have the potential to generate water contamination" as a qualifier to geological materials.	Agreed. Clean soil stored for the purpose of reclamation should be exempted from these storage requirements.	Add: "that have the potential to generate water contamination except for clean soil stored for the purpose of reclamation"	Added: "that have the potential to generate water contamination except for clean soil stored for the purpose of reclamation"
34	11.14.6.7	facilities for storage	1/30/2019	preferences dry stacked tailings impoundment, double lined electronic grid leak detection system for process solution management ponds, and highwalls backfilled/regraded to 3(H) to 1(V) or flatter. These prescriptive designs may limit the evaluation of other alternatives, which may be beneficial to all parties.	The LUA has the authority to consider changes to these requirements as allowed under 11.14.6.4.11.1.	No action.	No change.

Comment #	Section	Subject	Date Captured	Comment	Staff Analysis	Proposed Action	Applied
35	11.14.6.7.6	tailings	1/30/2019	aqueous tailings should be banned in Santa Fe County.	The County is aware of the risk associated with aqueous tailings. Section 11.14.6.7.6 states that "Tailings shall be dry stacked unless the Administrator determines that another method is more effective to ensure compliance with 11.14.3 (Design Criteria)." This section establishes a presumption for dry tailings but allows the LUA to take into account the best available science in making a final determination.	No action.	No change.
36	11.14.6.7.6	tailings	1/30/2019	requiring dry stacked tailings is prohibitive. Other intermediary tailings methods should be accepted.	See above comment.	No action.	No change.
37	11.14.6.7.7	stockpiling	1/30/2019	stockpiling requirements may not be possible to achieve during operation but are good for closure. Static factor of 1.0 is a common standard for during operation.	Typically a static factor of 1.0 is a 50/50 chance of the foundation remaining in place or not. Factor of safety of 1.5 is appropriate.	No change.	No change.
38	11.14.6.8	Maintenance of Highwalls	1/30/2019	Is this requirement for operation, closure, or both?	This requirement is for operation	Remove second sentence because it suggests that highwalls can be maintained	Removed: "If permitted, highwalls shall be maintained using the most effective techniques identified by the best available science."
39	11.14.7.1	Performance financial guarantee	1/30/2019	Add that the Admin can consider historical evidence in determining cost of potential impacts. Add long term operation and management of facilities to performance financial guarantee.	These are good suggestions and staff will modify this section.	Add that the LUA can consider historical evidence. Include the cost of long term operation and management of facilities along with closure, reclamation, monitoring and all costs associated with an operator ceasing operations. Shall be updated annually to reflect changes in any of these costs.	11.14.7 Added: "including the cost to review and update the Financial Guarantee annually"; 11.14.7.1 Added: "to manage and close the facility,"
40	11.14.7.1	financial assurance	1/30/2019	This subsection references irrevocable guarantees issued by a surety company. This appears to allow surety bonds, when the subsection 11.5.7.6 requires a guarantee be posted with a bank as an irrevocable [letter or credit or ILOC]. The FA terminology is nonstandard and should be clarified to explain what types of FA instruments would be accepted.	This is a good suggestion. This language places a limit on the Financial Guarantee.	Strike reference to surety company. Capitalize Financial Guarantee. Replace financial assurance with Financial Guarantee to show consistency throughout the document.	Removed: Surety company; assurance; Added: Guarantee and capitalized

Comment #	Section	Subject	Date Captured	Comment	Staff Analysis	Proposed Action	Applied
41	11.14.7.2	financial assurance	1/30/2019	This subsection references cash deposit as acceptable instruments for roadway damage compensation. The subsection 11.5.7.6 requires a guarantee be posted with a bank as an irrevocable [letter of credit or ILOC]. The FA terminology is nonstandard and should be clarified to explain what types of FA instruments would be accepted.	It is the intention of this section to require cash deposits for roadway damage. Staff does not see any conflict.	No action.	No change.
42	11.14.8.3	Leach and Spent Ore Facilities	1/30/2019	Leach and spent ore are the same thing. Consider choosing one term.	They are the same. One of the terms can be put in (). Also should include "lean ore" in this section.	Put one in (). Add "lean ore" to this section.	11.14.4.20.3 Added: "(Spent Ore and Lean Ore)"; Removed other reference to spent ore.
43	11.14.8.3	Leach and Spent Ore Facilities	1/30/2019	what is meant by detoxify? Should This say dewater? Also, there might not be any need to cover facility if the spent ore is being removed. Or consider allowing it to remain in place.	Detoxify is commonly used in cyanide or chemical leaching. Neutralizing chemical. Difficult to do reclamation of leach pads in place with our requirements for terrain management.	No change.	No change.
44	11.14.8.4.2	cover systems	1/30/2019	The month of September is wetter on average than June, so this section should read "...the long-term average summer/early fall precipitation (July, August and September)..."	This is a good suggestion.	Add: "...the long-term average summer/early fall precipitation (July, August and September)..."	Removed: (June, July and August); Added: (July, August and September)
45	11.5.6.6	reclamation	1/30/2019	If the reclamation costs are generated by an NM PE, they should be reviewed by a County PE. Also, reclamation requirements could cause double bonding with the state and federal governments.	The draft provides the LUA with the authority to contract with qualified professionals for any review.	No action.	No change.
46	11.5.6.6	reclamation	1/30/2019	This section seems to be referring to an irrevocable letter of credit (ILOC). Use of the term guarantee might cause confusion with other financial instruments (self-guarantees, corporate guarantees, etc.). MMD recommends using ILOC and stating as such.	Financial Guarantee is defined in the appendix of the SLDC and includes the option of an ILOC and other financial instruments. The LUA has the authority to choose which financial instrument she deems appropriate.	No action.	No change.

Comment #	Section	Subject	Date Captured	Comment	Staff Analysis	Proposed Action	Applied
47	11.5.6.6; 11.14.7	financial assurance	1/30/2019	The proposed amendments do not discuss a way to release financial assurance (subsections 11.5.6.6 and 11.14.7). This is a very important aspect of the financial assurance process, setting up adequate financial assurance, then releasing it back to the operator once the reclamation work has been accomplished, and approved by the county.	7.22.8 (Releases and Financial Guarantee) details the requirements and procedures for releasing financial guarantees. This applies to Chapter 11 and should be referenced.	Add reference to SLDC 7.22.8.	11.5.6.6 Added: "7.22.8 (Releases and Financial Guaranty) details procedures for releasing and demanding on a Financial Guarantee."
48	11.6.1.6	applicant background	1/28/2019	Is applicant background called out elsewhere in the SLDC ?	No, it is not required elsewhere in the SLDC. Given the history of mining in the US, applicant background is relevant. Similar requirements exist in other federal, state, and local regulations.	No action.	No change.
49	11.6.1.6	applicant background	1/28/2019	How many of the eight review criteria are 'showstoppers'? That is, how many would result in denial of an application?	The review of the applicant's background is part of the application process. All requirements of the application are examined and considered as part of the discretionary review process.	No action.	No change.
50	11.6.2; 11.7.2	review criteria	1/28/2019	will staff be doing a risk assessment based on the application? What standards and measures are being used to evaluate an application?	Risk assessment is not explicitly called out, but it is the purpose of the entire application process. Staff will review the application and make a recommendation per the requirements of these regulations. All requirements of the application are then examined and considered as part of the discretionary review process. The final decision is committed to the BCC.	No action.	No change.
51	11.7.1.7	cost estimate	1/30/2019	Clarify if requirement to submit a preliminary cost estimate for site improvements and reclamation represents the costs for Santa Fe County or the applicant to do the reclamation. Should the estimate be detailed or preliminary? may imply if reclamation is a detailed or preliminary design.	This is a cost estimate for the applicant to perform site improvement and reclamation.	No action.	No change.

Comment #	Section	Subject	Date Captured	Comment	Staff Analysis	Proposed Action	Applied
52	11.7.1.8 and chapter-wide	environmental/social standards	1/24/2019	No mention of the following environmental impacts: temperature impacts, when noise levels occur and their duration, odors, nuclear radiation, electromagnetic or microwave intensity levels, invasive and noxious plants, native plants and wildlife including pollinators, soil biological health and microbiology of soil, wildfire, community cohesion, changes in demography associated with DCI, impacts on vulnerable people, disaster preparedness, economic diversity and employment, economic benefits and multiplier effects, impacts on tourism, spirit of place and impact on culture values and native sovereignty.	To the extent that the EIR does not explicitly require consideration of these impacts, the County has the authority to require consideration of these and other impacts if relevant to the proposed DCI (11.7.1.8).	No action.	No change.
53	11.7.1.9.3	Reclamation	1/30/2019	Language potentially conflicts with 11.14.9. Add "to the extent practicable" to 11.14.9.	The County does not see conflict between these provisions. Both provisions require that reclamation of one phase begin prior to initiation of the next phase.	No action.	No change.
54	11.7.1.9.3 (b)	grading	1/30/2019	3:1 slope may cause confusion if not delineated. Consider delineating 3(H) to 1 (V) slope. Also, this standard may be difficult to meet for high walls in pits without backfilling them as is the preference in subsection 11.14.6.6.1.	"3:1" is used elsewhere in the SLDC and has not caused confusion. Staff suggests leaving it as is to keep consistency with other parts of the Code. The second comment is not an issue because backfilling is presumed. To the extent the Board determines that a highwall is allowed, they have the authority to adjust slope requirement.	No action.	No change.

Comment #	Section	Subject	Date Captured	Comment	Staff Analysis	Proposed Action	Applied
55	11.7.1.9.3 c	revegetation	1/30/2019	Revegetation requirements mention that if irrigation is needed, the reclamation plan shall explain how the site will be managed in perpetuity. This may conflict with NMMA approval requirements for new mines with respect to a self-sustaining ecosystem (19.10.6.606.B(1) NMAC) and not having perpetual care (19.10.6.606.B(7) NMAC). Maybe perpetuity has a different meaning here, should perhaps be defined.	This sentence does not make sense in the context.	Strike the "in perpetuity" sentence	Removed: "If irrigation is necessary, the plan shall explain how the site will be managed in perpetuity."
56	11.7.1.9.8	Proof of responsible and established technology and practices	1/30/2019	"without any incidents" may be very difficult to achieve because of the nature of reclamation often earthwork and establishment of vegetation. Maybe, a better requirement would be to meet reclamation standards over a period of 5 to 10 years. Use Best Management Practices, applied in US and Canada.	We agree. This language is inconsistent with the intent of the paragraph.	Delete phrase beginning with "without any incidents" to the end of paragraph.	Removed: "without any incidents that would result in noncompliance with any of the standards of this Chapter and the SLDC. The burden of proof of harmlessness for any proposed technology lies with the proponent of the innovation, not the County or the general public."
57	11.8.3	Water Resources	1/30/2019	Add reference to NMAC 20.6.2	This was an oversight that will be addressed.	Add reference to NMAC 20.6.2	Added: "NMAC 20.6.2 and"
58	11.8.4.1; 11.14.4.19	wildlife	1/24/2019	How could a mine not disturb wildlife habitat? habitat and wildlife corridors should be modified to mitigate/offset/compensate for impact on wildlife. Wildlife impact plan should apply to all DCIs, not just mines	11.14.4.19 requires a wildlife impact mitigation plan for mining. Staff determined to include wildlife impact plan in general regulations for DCIs without reference to 11.14.4.8 and 11.14.4.10.	Add to 11.7.1.9: Wildlife Impact Plan: first 1.5 sentence of 11.14.4.19.	11.7.1.9 added: "9. Wildlife Impact Mitigation Plan. The applicant shall submit a Wildlife Impact Mitigation Plan developed by a wildlife specialist approved by the Administrator. The Plan shall describe how any impacts on wildlife attributable to the DCI will be eliminated and/or mitigated to the greatest extent possible."
59	11.8.5.5	Cut and Fill Slopes	1/30/2019	Does this section refer to operations, closure or both? There are some circumstances where vertical slopes may actually be optimal. Add "properly designed" to retaining wall.	This is a performance standard and applies to operation. It does not currently apply to closure but staff believes that it should.	Add: "unless a properly designed retaining wall is used" "Administrator may vary from these requirements based on the report". Add performance standards to the closure requirements to the extent applicable.	11.8.5.5 Added: "properly designed"; "and the Board may impose conditions base don that report." 11.14.6 Added: "The following performance standards shall apply to both operation and closure of a mineral resource extraction and processing operation to the extent applicable."; 11.14.8 Moved all to 11.14.4.20 and Added: "The closure of a Mining operation shall comply with the approved Closure Plan (11.14.4.21)."

Comment	Section	Subject	Date Captured	Comment	Staff Analysis	Proposed Action	Applied
60	11.8.5.5	Cut and Fill Slopes	1/30/2019	May be no steeper than 2 (H) to 1 (V). Clarify that this is temporary terrain management standard so as not to conflict with 11.7.1.9.3 (b)	This is an operational standard. 11.7.1.9.3.b applies to reclamation. 2:1 should be kept as and fill slopes should be changed to 3:1 for consistency is for consistency	Change fill slopes to 3:1; Add: "properly designed" and allow the Board to impose conditions.	11.8.5.5 Changed to: "Cut slopes shall be graded to a slope no steeper than 2:1, and fill slopes shall be graded to a slope no steeper than 3:1; Added: "properly designed"; "and the Board may impose conditions based on that report."
61	11.8.5.7	Sediment and Erosion	1/30/2019	Conflict with 11.14.6.6.4. Add that this does not apply to sediment ponds.	This was an oversight that will be addressed.	Add: excluding sediment ponds pursuant to 11.14.6.6.4	Added: "excluding properly designed sediment ponds pursuant to section 11.14.6.6.4."
62	11.8.9	financial feasibility	1/18/2019	Incorrect citation for financial assurances section. Change to 11.5.6	This was an oversight that will be addressed.	Change citation	Changed citation to 11.5.6.
63	11.9.3.2; 11.10.3.2	setbacks	1/31/2019	300 ft. setback is too close for junkyards, feedlots, and landfills in the case where it is adjacent to a residences or potential residential areas.	The 300 ft. setback was established by the BCC in the SLDC. This setback is defined from the property boundary. The property boundary of a DCI may not be within 1/4 mile of a residential structure or an area subdivided for residential development.	Staff proposes clarifying language in 11.9.3.2.2 and 11.10.3.2: "The property boundary of a DCI shall not be located closer than one-quarter (1/4) mile from the property boundary of any existing dwelling or platted subdivision."	11.10.3.2 Added: "2. the property boundaries shall not be located closer than one-quarter (1/4) mile from any existing dwelling or land subdivided for residential development."
64	General	zoning designation	1/28/2019	is zoning already locked in? could a resident still apply for a DCI on their residential property?	The SLDC has established base zoning for the County. Any parcel can apply for a DCI Overlay Zone if they meet the requirements of the SLDC.	No action.	No change.
65		Citations	1/30/2019	Several citations of 11.14.3 are incorrect (ex: 11.13.3 instead). Check all citations.	This was an oversight that will be addressed.	Change citation.	Changed reference to 11.13.3 to 11.14.3 throughout the document.

